

Application Serial No. 10/645,573
Reply to Office Action dated April 20, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner outlined a restriction between claims 1-17 drawn to a dishwasher, classified in Class 134, subclass 56D and claims 18-19 drawn to a method of loading and dispensing detergent in a dishwasher, classified in Class 134, subclass 25.2. The Examiner argues that the inventions are distinct as the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand.

This rejection is respectfully traversed as the Applicant respectfully submits that it would not be an undue burden upon the Examiner to search two subclasses in the same Class. Moreover, given that the method as claimed requires many of the same limitations found in the apparatus claims, the Applicant respectfully submits that searching both inventions would not place an undue burden upon the Examiner. However, in order to fully respond to the restriction requirement prior to reconsideration by the Examiner, the Applicant elects, with traverse, to continue prosecution on claims 1-17.

At this point, if the Examiner should have any additional questions or concerns regarding this matter, he is cordially invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,



Everett G. Diederiks, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 33,323

Date: May 12, 2006
DIEDERIKS & WHITELAW, PLC
12471 Dillingham Square, #301
Woodbridge, VA 22192
Tel: (703) 583-8300
Fax: (703) 583-8301